



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/997,336	11/29/2001	Yakov Kamen	ISURFTV150	4993

52940 7590 07/14/2006

TODD S. PARKHURST
HOLLAND & KNIGHT LLP
131 S. DEARBORN STREET
30TH FLOOR
CHICAGO, IL 60603

EXAMINER

VAN HANDEL, MICHAEL P

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2623

DATE MAILED: 07/14/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This action is responsive to an Amendment filed 4/26/2006. Claims **1, 3-9, 11-17, 19, 20** are pending. Claims **1, 3, 6, 9, 11, 14, 17** are amended. Claims **2, 10, 18** are canceled.

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 4/26/2006 with respect to claims **1, 9, and 17** have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding claims **1, 9, and 17**, the applicant argues that Davis et al. fails to disclose selectively removing at least one character from a text of a program title to create an abbreviated program title, the abbreviated program title retaining an essential meaning of the program title, the selectively removing comprising parsing the text of the program title, determining at least one nonessential, non relational word of the program title, and removing the nonessential, non relational word from the program title. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Davis et al. discloses allowing an editor to alter a title so that it will fit in an allotted space within a program grid (col. 18, l. 13-18). Davis et al. further illustrates the benefits of the text fit system in Figs. 11a and 11b (col. 19, l. 39-44 & Figs. 11a, 11b). In this illustration, it is clearly shown that the editor has determined that the nonrelational word "today" is a nonessential word and has therefore chosen to remove it. This meets the limitation "selectively removing at least one character from a text of a program title to create an abbreviated program title, the abbreviated program title retaining an essential meaning of the program title, the selectively removing

Art Unit: 2623

comprising parsing the text of the program title, determining at least one nonessential, non relational word of the program title, and removing the nonessential, non relational word from the program title” as claimed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims **1, 9, 17** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Davis et al.

Referring to claims **1** and **9**, Davis et al. discloses a machine-readable medium/method comprising:

- selectively removing at least one character from a text of a program title to create an abbreviated program title, the abbreviated program title retaining an essential meaning of the program title, the selectively removing comprising parsing the text of the program title, determining at least one nonessential, non relational word of the program title, and removing the nonessential, non relational word from the program title (col. 18, l. 13-22)(Figs. 11a-11b); and
- displaying the abbreviated program title in a program title field of an onscreen program guide, the program title field capable of displaying a specified number of characters (col. 19, l. 19-27).

Referring to claim **17**, Davis et al. discloses an apparatus comprising:

Art Unit: 2623

- a memory 115 (col. 17, l. 49-50)(Fig. 1);
- a program title stored within the memory (col. 17, l. 60-63);
- a program title abbreviation software stored within the memory (col. 18, l. 13-21);
- a processor to execute the program title abbreviation software such that an abbreviated program title is created, the abbreviated program title containing a specified number of characters, the abbreviated program title retaining an essential meaning of the program title, the abbreviated title generated by parsing the text of the program title, determining at least one nonessential, nonrelational word of the program title, and removing the nonessential, nonrelational word from the program title (col. 18, l. 13-22, 36-43)(Figs. 11a-11b); and
- a display device capable of displaying the specified number of characters (col. 18, l. 15).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims **3-5, 8, 11-13, 16, 19-20** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis et al. in view of Kudrolli et al.

Referring to claims **3, 11, and 19**, Davis et al. discloses the methods/apparatus of claims 1, 9, and 17, respectively. Davis et al. does not disclose:

Art Unit: 2623

- d) determining at least one relational word of the program title; and
- e) replacing the at least one relational word with a representative character.

Kudrolli et al. discloses replacing the word “and” with the character “&” in order to cope with display space constraints in computer software (Fig. 20). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time that the invention was made to modify Davis et al. to include replacing the word “and” with the character “&” such as that taught by Kudrolli et al. in order to make program guides more useful for a viewer and more pleasant to watch (Davis et al. col. 2, l. 38-41). Referring to claim **19**, Davis further does not disclose:

Referring to claims **4**, **12**, and **20**, the combination of Davis et al. and Kudrolli et al. teaches:

- a) determining at least one essential word of a program title;
- b) determining the number of characters necessary to display the at least one essential word; and
- c) abbreviating the at least one essential word if the number of characters necessary to display the at least one essential word is greater than the specified number of characters (Kudrolli et al. col. 7, l. 48-55).

Referring to claims **5** and **13**, the combination of Davis et al. and Kudrolli et al. teaches:

- f) determining a plurality of essential words of the program title;
- g) determining the number of characters necessary to display the plurality of essential words; and
- h) removing an essential word if the number of characters necessary to display the plurality of essential words is greater than the specified number of characters (the

Art Unit: 2623

examiner notes that the title word will be deleted only if the prior four steps are exhausted (col. 7, l. 61).

Referring to claims **8** and **16**, the combination of Davis et al. and Kudrolli et al. teaches that an essential word occurring most frequently in a database is removed (Kudrolli et al. col. 7, l. 40-47).

5. Claims **6**, **14** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis et al. in view of Knauft et al.

Referring to claims **6** and **14**, Davis et al. discloses the methods of claims 1 and 9, respectively. Davis et al. does not disclose that the at least one nonessential, nonrelational word comprises all of the words selected from the group consisting of adverbs, adjectives, prepositions, and articles. Knauft et al. discloses an electronic document retrieval system that removes adjectives or adverbs from the document prior to presenting the document to an information retrieval (IR) engine. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time that the invention was made to modify Davis et al. to include removing adjectives or adverbs from an electronic document prior to its presentation such as that taught by Knauft et al. in order to provide information to a system that is almost as usable as the original (col. 2, l. 31-33). The USPTO considers the applicant's "selected from the group consisting of" language to be anticipated by any reference containing any of the subsequent corresponding elements.

6. Claims **7**, **15** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis et al. in view of Kudrolli et al. and further in view of Hejna, Jr.

Art Unit: 2623

Referring to claims 7 and 15, the combination of Davis et al. and Kudrolli et al. teaches the methods of claims 4 and 12, respectively. The combination of Davis et al. and Kudrolli et al. does not teach that the at least one essential word comprises all of the words selected from the group consisting of subject, object nouns, and verbs. Hejna, Jr. discloses removing articles and adjectives from conceptual information contained within TV broadcasts to provide output comprised only of nouns and noun phrases (col. 14, l. 16-19)(col. 16, l. 46-51). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time that the invention was made to modify the combination of Davis et al. and Kudrolli et al. to include providing output comprised only of nouns and noun phrases such as that taught by Hejna, Jr. in order to make a program guide more useful to a viewer and more pleasant to watch (Davis et al. col. 2, l. 38-41). The USPTO considers the applicant's "selected from the group consisting of" language to be anticipated by any reference containing any of the subsequent corresponding elements.

Conclusion

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

Art Unit: 2623

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Van Handel whose telephone number is 571.272.5968. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 8:00am-5:30pm.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chris Grant can be reached on 571.272.7294. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Note to Applicant

Art Units 2611, 2614 and 2617 have changed to 2623. Please make all future correspondence indicate the new designation 2623.

Michael Van Handel
Examiner
Art Unit 2623


CHRIS KELLEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600

Application/Control Number: 09/997,336

Page 9

Art Unit: 2623

MVH